



Power Siting Board

Mike DeWine, Governor
Sam Randazzo, Chairman

Board Members

Director, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Director, Ohio Development Services Agency
Director, Ohio Department of Health
Director, Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Director, Ohio Department of Agriculture
Public Member
Ohio House of Representatives
Ohio Senate

Power Siting Board Rule Review

Summary of Discussion

Third Stakeholder Meeting: May 12, 2020

Siting review agencies, state legislators

Thank you to all who attended and participated in this workshop. The notes below represent a general summary of the suggestions, comments, and/or guidance provided. The notes are not intended to be an official transcript of the meeting, nor will they take the place of or supersede the detailed written comments that many participants or interested parties/stakeholders are developing relative to the questions we provided prior to the meeting.

Opening remarks

- Chairman Randazzo introduced the new director of the Ohio Power Siting Board, Theresa White.

Public input

- Concern were raised that some feel local feedback has been disregarded. Chairman Randazzo responded that the Board has committed to having at least one Board member present at each public hearing, though the Chairman echoed that there is work to be done at the local level in terms of public input.
- Additional concerns were raised there is a lack of transparency in that local citizens are finding out about projects long after lease agreements have been signed privately.
- The feedback of local airports should be considered to preserve commerce.

Board considerations and process

- The Board should examine the cumulative effect of multiple projects in a single area, such as six in Seneca County.
- The Board should examine the impact that wind turbines have over time; bird kills and turbine failures were mentioned.
- Warranty and merchantability are important issues and should inform safety considerations.

- The Board should consider multigenerational land use.
- It was suggested that in situations where there's a promise of monetary gain for schools, this should be in writing and notarized.
- The question was asked: after sites are up and running, what type of reporting is currently required and what changes are needed to have a better understanding of certain aspects of site development?
- The question was asked: how does the Board select expert testimony to have better understanding of safety issues and the validity of applicant claims?
- Concerns were brought up about pipeline developers making claims about a project in an effort to get approval, and later seeking reevaluation from the Department of Taxation. Chairman Randazzo responded that the taxation question may be more for the Ohio legislature, but the concern goes to quality of information that gets to the public when they're trying to evaluate a project, and the Board understands that concern.